## APPEAL NO. 020423 FILED MARCH 26, 2002

This appeal arises pursuant to the Te	exas Workers' Compensation Act, TEX. LAB.
CODE ANN. § 401.001 et seq. (1989 Act). A	A contested case hearing was held on January
23, 2002. The hearing officer determined that the appellant (claimant) had not sustained	
a repetitive trauma injury on	_ (all dates are 2001 unless otherwise noted),
and that the claimant did not have any disabil	ity.

The claimant appeals, contending that the hearing officer erred in her findings; asserts that two doctors had diagnosed a neck injury; and requests that we "reform" the hearing officer's decision. The respondent (self-insured) responds, urging affirmance.

## **DECISION**

Affirmed.

We have reviewed the complained-of determinations and conclude that the issues involved fact questions for the hearing officer. Many of the documents, and the claimant's testimony, give differing dates of injury, including \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_, as well as , and differing mechanisms of injury such as "stepping into a truck and hit her head on the door frame," holding a sun roof, and undefined repetitive traumatic activities. The hearing officer commented that the claimant's "testimony was confusing to follow in that she jumped back and forth from a date of , 2001 to , with no adequate explanation." The claimant, in her appeal, cites a medical report which indicates an "injury to her cervico cranial region . . . as a result of her repetitive job activities," but that report indicates a \_\_\_\_\_ date of injury. In any event, it is the hearing officer, as the finder of fact, who determines what facts have been established and who resolves conflicts and inconsistencies in the evidence. Garza v. Commercial Insurance Company of Newark, New Jersey, 508 S.W.2d 701 (Tex. Civ. App.-Amarillo 1974, no writ). The hearing officer did so and we conclude that her determinations are not so against the great weight and preponderance of the evidence as to be clearly wrong or manifestly unjust. Cain v. Bain, 709 S.W.2d 175, 176 (Tex. 1986).

The hearing officer's decision and order are affirmed.

The true corporate name of the insurance carrier is **(a certified self-insured)** and the name and address of its registered agent for service of process is

## C.T. CORPORATION SYSTEMS 350 N. ST. PAUL DALLAS, TEXAS 75201.

	Thomas A. Knapp Appeals Judge
CONCUR:	
Chris Cowan Appeals Judge	
Elaine M. Chaney Appeals Judge	